

power has come to us too quickly. But, we have blundered, and blundered badly, in practically every instance where we have used naked, military power to support or to change a particular governmental status quo.

I suggest that this is true because of two things:

First, we are not sophisticated enough to understand the limitations of power and its wise use. Perhaps, even more, because we have forgotten the famous dictum of Lord Acton, when he said:

Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Perhaps Senators have read the article written by James Reston in last Sunday's New York Times, on its editorial page, on corruption and ethics. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: HOW CORRUPT IS AMERICA?  
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25— How Corrupt is America? This is not a popular question. Moral speculation is "out" in New York and Washington, but even the sophisticates of the great commercial, artistic and political capitals of the United States cannot avoid the question.

They have been through too much in the last few years to avoid even if they scoff at the question of corruption. The assassination of a President, the violence of the racial struggle, the civil disorders in the cities, the war in Vietnam, the conflict in the universities, the Oswald case, the Powell case, the Ruby case, the Senator Dodd case, the Bobby Baker case, the C.I.A. case, the wiretapping cases, the argument over who is telling the truth in the White House; in the Manchester-Kennedy book controversy; in the J. Edgar Hoover-Kennedy argument about wiretapping—all this has produced too many boat-rocking facts to be dismissed as the silly moralizing of cranky world-bettering reformers.

THE BIG QUESTION

In fact, this question about the corruption of personal and institutional standards in America is the one thing that troubles most of the leaders on all sides of all the current controversies. Rich and poor, black and white, Republican and Democrat, hawks and doves, are all worrying about it. Of course they are all complaining about the corruption of somebody else, but at least they are united on one proposition—that something is wrong, that there is now no common code of conduct in the United States that unites the nation and guides its people about what is right and what is wrong.

Washington consistently tries to avoid facing this fact. The leaders of both parties in the Congress know that the Central Intelligence Agency's activities need to be investigated, but they have decided this week not to investigate it. The President knows that he is responsible for what the C.I.A. has been doing to use university students for intelligence purposes, but he is passing the buck to Nick Katzenbach at the State Department, John Gardner at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Richard Helms at the C.I.A.

Nevertheless, these political maneuvers will not work in the end. The Congressional leaders may try to smother the C.I.A. controversy, but some members of the Congress will insist on talking about it in the House and Senate. The President may try to correct the system quietly—and the evidence is that he is trying to correct it fairly—but

members of his Administration will insist on talking honestly and openly about the facts, and this is the main point of the question of corruption.

The habit of honesty in the United States, in its people and institutions, is still too strong to be overwhelmed. Whatever else can be said about the press, it will print the facts about the C.I.A. ties to the American Newspaper Guild or to prominent newspaper publishers. Whatever the Congressional leaders decide to do about not investigating the C.I.A., members of Congress will discuss the problem.

TRADITION AND CONSCIENCE

Some student leaders may take money from the C.I.A. and be quiet about it, but others, troubled by tradition or conscience, will express what they really think. Some politicians will defend the Administration regardless of what it does, but others will tell the truth, even if it hurts their own party. Some newspapers will not risk the dangers of defying political power, commercial power and labor union power, but a few will, and when they do, their disclosures will be widely reported by the news agencies and the radio and television networks to the rest of the nation.

In this sense the institutions of America are not corrupted. They are under pressure of various kinds but something in the tradition of the country keeps them doing what they were intended to do under the Constitution.

A good case, therefore, can be made for the proposition that while there is plenty of corruption in America, the corruption is somehow exposed, and condemned by the nation when it is exposed. Bobby Baker, Adam Clayton Powell, Senator Dodd, all had their day but they were caught. The legal system trapped Baker, and the Congress has brought both Powell and Dodd to the bar of the Congress. The C.I.A. tried to conceal its arrangements with students, radio stations, magazines, and student organizations, but the facts came out.

Fortunately, the Johnson Administration now understands this fundamental point. It has stopped its secret funds to the students. It is finally reviewing all its activities with universities, labor unions and other private organizations. It is looking for ways to finance legitimate student programs by open and private means, and the Congress is now more sympathetic to this procedure.

INFLUENCE OF THE PUBLIC

The mail coming into the White House and the Congress is a major factor in all this—much more than the letterwriters realize. These letters are expressing the moral conscience of the nation. They are arguing for equality of the races. They are calling for moderation in the war, and protesting violently against the past activities of Powell, Baker, Dodd, and others who have been accused of misusing political power.

Public opinion in America in this way still exercises great influence. It affects the decisions of the Executive and the legislature. It is for equality, peace, and freedom. It is more powerful than the lobbyists for special interests. And it is a much greater force for moderation in the White House and in the Congress than is generally realized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I fear that the whole problem of misuse of military power has not been given adequate consideration either in the White House, the Pentagon, or "Foggy Bottom."

As the Senator from Washington stated, of course we champion peaceful change. That is easy. The big question is, advocates of peaceful change and resisters of aggression though we may be, have we read the facts right when we justify sending 400,000 young Americans

into the jungles in southeast Asia to intervene in what is essentially a dirty little civil war?

I suspect that we blundered because we overreached ourselves, not understanding the wise use of that enormous power which we possess today.

The Senator from Washington suggests that we should be governed by the old-fashioned balance-of-power theory.

That balance of power did succeed for almost 100 years, from the Treaty of Vienna in 1815 up until the outbreak of World War I in 1914 in, generally speaking, keeping the peace. But those were the days before nuclear war. Those were the days before radiological, biological, and chemical warfare. Those were the days when Europe was the main consideration. Latin America, Africa, and practically all of Asia were not particularly affected by the balance of power because there was no great Asian power, as China has since become, and as Japan was once—and will be again—which could act as a countervailing balance of power against the white colonials in that part of the world.

The Senator from Washington refers to SEATO as a treaty commitment on our part requiring us—perhaps he did not say, "requiring," but I suggest it is implied—requiring us to move into Vietnam. This comment has been made on several occasions by Secretary of State Rusk, but only after he had made practically every other argument that could be thought of to justify our intervention in the civil war, which he denies is a civil war. As I understand it, he still contends that this is nothing more than aggression from the North with the Vietcong the tools of the Hanoi government.

This is a contention which, incidentally, I think is becoming weaker and weaker and less credible as time goes on—particularly in light of the statistics which I quoted a little earlier.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, let me quote a statement made by Lt. Gen. Jesus Vargas, Secretary General of SEATO, at the opening of the 11th Council meeting in Canberra, Australia, on June 27, 1966:

"Viet-Nam, therefore, rather than being held up as a symbol of SEATO's alleged inaction, should be looked upon for what it actually is—a symbol of spontaneity, the determination and the singleness of purpose with which many free countries from different parts of the world have come to the aid of an embattled friend and ally. In relation to SEATO in particular, Viet-Nam is incontrovertible proof of the wide latitude of freedom open to individual members of the alliance to choose the manner and degree of assistance to be rendered, or even for any one member to withhold assistance or keep the matter under consideration for as long as it pleases.

"As we all know, assistance under the Manila Pact may be either collective or individual. This permits member nations to undertake, along with nonmember countries holding common values and persuasions, and on their own individual choice, actions necessary to preserve peace and freedom in our part of the world."

How could it be more abundantly clear that the Secretary of State is wrong when he relies on an obligation in the SEATO treaty to justify our massive